

CONTRACT INSPECTION REPORT		CONTRACT NO. <div style="border:1px solid black; width:100px; height:30px; margin:5px 0;"></div>	TASK NO. <div style="border:1px solid black; width:100px; height:30px; margin:5px 0;"></div>		
TO:		25X1			
		(8629) 682			
		25 August 1968			
		INSPECTION REPORT NO. (If final, so state)			
		ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE			
		15 September 1969			
NAME OF CONTRACTOR					
Corning Glass Works					
TYPE OF COMMODITY OR SERVICE					
Improved Rear Projection Screen					
THE CONTRACTOR IS ON SCHEDULE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		THE CONTRACTOR WILL PROBABLY REMAIN WITHIN ALLOCATED FUNDS <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO IF ANSWER IS "NO" ADVISE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR ACTION OF SPONSORING OFFICE, ON REVERSE HEREOF. IF KNOWN, INDICATE MAGNITUDE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS INVOLVED.			
PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED - 7%					
PER CENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED - Unknown (over)					
HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FINAL REPORT, PROTOTYPE, OR OTHER END ITEM BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE PERIOD? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO (If yes, give details on reverse side.)					
HAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY BEEN DELIVERED TO CONTRACTOR DURING THIS PERIOD? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO (If yes, indicate items, quantity, and cost on reverse side.)					
INCENTIVES					
IS THIS AN INCENTIVE CONTRACT <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO IF YES, CHECK TYPE <input type="checkbox"/> COST <input type="checkbox"/> AWARD FEE <input type="checkbox"/> PERFORMANCE <input type="checkbox"/> DELIVERY		NOTE: USE REVERSE SIDE FOR COMMENTS. FINAL REPORT MUST CONTAIN INCENTIVE EVALUATION.			
OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR					
1. <input type="checkbox"/> OUTSTANDING 4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ABOVE AVERAGE 7. <input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY 2. <input type="checkbox"/> EXCELLENT 5. <input type="checkbox"/> AVERAGE 3. <input type="checkbox"/> VERY GOOD 6. <input type="checkbox"/> MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE					
IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR IS UNSATISFACTORY OR MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE INDICATE REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.					
RECOMMENDED ACTION					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED <input type="checkbox"/> WITHHOLD PAYMENT PENDING SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE <input type="checkbox"/> CLOSE OUT <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (Specify)					
IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT PUT COMMENTS ON REVERSE IN NARRATIVE FORM ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERABLE ITEMS UNDER THE CONTRACT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED. THESE INCLUDE, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:					
ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY	ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY
PROTOTYPES			MANUALS		
DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS			FINAL REPORT		
PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS			SPECIAL TOOLING		
			OTHER GOVERNMENT PROPERTY		
DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR					
30 July 1968					
SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR			DIVISION		
<div style="border:1px solid black; width:100%; height:100%;"></div>			<div style="border:1px solid black; width:100%; height:100%;"></div>		

NARRATIVE REPORT

☒ INTERIM☐ FINAL

The Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (Inspector) visited the Contractor's plant in Raleigh, North Carolina on 30 July 1968 for the purpose of conducting the required periodic inspection. Contractor's representatives presented during this visit were [redacted]

25X1
25X1

[redacted] advised that during the period between termination of the previous Contract [redacted] in January 1968, and the commencement of the present contract, the Contractor had accomplished some further work on discrete particle scattering screens for other Corning applications. Specifically, the scattering particles had been changed from aluminum oxide to ground glass and sample screens with separate absorbing and scattering layers had been fabricated but the characteristics had not been measured. These samples were displayed for subjective evaluation by the inspector. (In the inspector's opinion, these samples were inferior to those furnished as end products under the previous contract.) [redacted] then stated that Corning now considered that the major effort should be directed toward investigating and developing a lenticular screen. Accordingly, he presented a letter (unaddressed), dated 30 July 1968, containing such a recommendation. The inspector advised [redacted] that this recommendation would be considered.

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

Subsequent discussion centered on the Corning developed testing equipment and the possibility of NPIC conducting operational subjective tests on future sample screens developed under this contract. The inspector will coordinate the prosecution of these tests at NPIC on a not-to-interfer basis. It is anticipated that these tests will not involve the expenditure of Government funds but will be accomplished during the prosecution of routine tasks.

In answer to previous queries, the inspector advised [redacted] of the following:

25X1

a. A system approached by Corning would be authorized and they would be advised of the ideal time to effect coordination with the rear projection viewer manufacturer [redacted]

25X1

b. The basic definitions and descriptions of the test equipment presented by Corning in their final report under the previous contract, were being reviewed by our technical experts with a view toward having a meeting of the minds on these items and their application to the present contract.

c. If Corning believes a relaxation of screen specifications is required, they should originate a written request for such action based on the knowledge gained by them in prosecuting the previous contract.

d. Isolating the operating area in which the rear projection viewer will be used may be highly desirable in order to aid in minimizing the screen reflectance, but is not practical. Therefore, any rear projection screens developed under the present contract should not depend on such isolation.

e. The long range prediction by Corning that follow-on manufacture of lenticular screens in quantity may be prohibitive due to unusual production costs would be given due consideration. However, this was an unpredictable type problem which might be influenced by a number of other factors or, possibly, change with newly developed techniques.

f. Corning should submit their technical and financial reports together every four weeks as they did under the previous contract (the first of these reports has not been received to date).

The inspector did not make any commitments relative to accepting Corning's recommendation to place future emphasis on lenticular screens.

☐ UNCLASSIFIED☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ SECRET